

COSMETIC CONTACT SURGERIES ALONG TRANSVERSE KNOTS AND THE KNOT COMPLEMENT PROBLEM

MARC KEGEL

ABSTRACT. We study cosmetic contact surgeries along transverse knots in the standard contact 3-sphere, i.e. contact surgeries that yield again the standard contact 3-sphere. The main result is that we can exclude non-trivial cosmetic contact surgeries (in sufficiently small tubular neighborhoods) along all transverse knots not isotopic to the transverse unknot with self-linking number -1 .

As a corollary it follows that every transverse knot in the standard contact 3-sphere is determined by the contactomorphism type of any sufficiently big exterior. Moreover, we give counterexamples to this for transverse links in the standard contact 3-sphere and for transverse knots in general contact manifolds.

1. INTRODUCTION

Dehn surgery is the process of removing a tubular neighborhood of a (tame) knot in the 3-sphere S^3 and gluing a solid torus back by a homeomorphism of the boundaries to get a new 3-manifold. This was first used in 1910 by Dehn for easy and effective constructions of homology spheres [De10]. In fact, a fundamental theorem due to Lickorish and Wallace says that every connected closed oriented 3-manifold can be obtained by Dehn surgery along a **link** from S^3 [Li62, Wa60].

This connection between knot theory in S^3 and 3-manifold topology in general lead to many interesting results in both areas. One of the most striking applications of Dehn surgery to knot theory is the *knot complement theorem* for knots in S^3 . In 1908 Tietze asked if a knot in S^3 is determined by the homeomorphism type of its complement [Ti08]. While this is not true for links in S^3 [Wh37] and for knots in general 3-manifolds [Ma92, Ro93], the original question remained a long time open, until it was spectacularly answered in the affirmative by Gordon and Luecke in 1989 [GoLu89].

Gordon and Luecke proved a slightly more general statement about Dehn surgery, namely that if a non-trivial Dehn surgery along a single knot K in S^3 gives back S^3 (a so-called *cosmetic* Dehn surgery), then the knot K has to be equivalent to the unknot. From this it follows very easily that every knot in S^3 is determined by its exterior and, by work of Edwards [Ed64], also by its complement.

The connection between these two different results is as follows. Given the meridian on a knot exterior, it is easy to reconstruct the knot. First one can glue a 2-disk D^2 to the meridian in a unique way. Then the boundary of the resulting object is a 2-sphere S^2 to which one can glue a 3-ball B^3 in a unique way. Therefore there is a unique way to glue a solid torus to the boundary of a knot exterior, such that

Date: March 17, 2017.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 53D35; 53D10, 57M25, 57M27, 57R65, 57N40.

Key words and phrases. transverse knots, knot complement problem, contact surgery.

the meridian of this solid torus maps to the meridian of the knot. The knot is then recovered as the spine of this newly glued-in solid torus. With this discussion the knot complement problem reduces to the question, in how many different ways one can glue a solid torus to the boundary of a knot exterior to get S^3 back, which is nothing but the existence question of cosmetic Dehn surgeries.

Here we want to study similar questions for transverse knots in contact 3-manifolds. A (coorientable) *contact structure* on a smooth 3-manifold M is a *completely non-integrable* 2-plane field $\xi \subset TM$, meaning that there exists a globally defined 1-form α on M , such that $\alpha \wedge d\alpha$ is a volume form of M . The so-called standard contact structure ξ_{st} on $S^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ is given in Cartesian coordinates as $\xi_{\text{st}} = \ker(x_1 dy_1 - y_1 dx_1 + x_2 dy_2 - y_2 dx_2)$. A smooth knot T in a contact manifold (M, ξ) is called *transverse*, if it is always transverse to the contact structure. It is easy to see that every topological knot can be C^0 -close approximated by a transverse knot. For this and other background on contact topology we refer the reader to the standard textbook [Ge08].

By using that every transverse knot looks locally the same, Martinet could make Dehn surgery along transverse knots compatible with the contact structures [Ge08, Theorem 4.1.2]. Together with the theorem of Lickorish and Wallace it follows that every closed oriented 3-manifold carries a contact structure. In fact, every contact structure on any closed 3-manifold can be obtained by contact surgery along a transverse link from (S^3, ξ_{st}) [Ga99, Ga02, DiGe04, BaEt13, Co15].

Here we study cosmetic contact Dehn surgeries along transverse knots in (S^3, ξ_{st}) , i.e. contact Dehn surgeries yielding again (S^3, ξ_{st}) . From a result of Etnyre and Ghrist [EtGh99, Theorem 2.2] it follows, that cosmetic contact surgeries do exist along a transverse unknot with self-linking number $\text{sl} = -1$. In contrast to this, is our main result which is proven in Section 3.

Theorem 1.1 (Transverse contact surgery theorem)

Let T be a transverse knot in (S^3, ξ_{st}) , which is not isotopic to a transverse unknot with $\text{sl} = -1$. Then there exists no non-trivial contact Dehn surgery along T in a sufficiently small tubular neighborhood of T yielding (S^3, ξ_{st}) back.

In Section 2 we provide the necessary background about transverse knots in contact 3-manifolds and contact Dehn surgery along transverse knots and make these statements more precise.

As an easy application of this result we prove in Section 4 the following generalization of the theorem of Gordon and Luecke.

Corollary 1.2 (Transverse knot exterior theorem)

Two transverse knots in (S^3, ξ_{st}) are isotopic if and only if their sufficiently big exteriors are contactomorphic.

We conclude in Section 5 with a discussion about the size of the standard tubular neighborhoods of transverse knots, with explicit counterexamples to Corollary 1.2 in the case of transverse links in (S^3, ξ_{st}) and transverse knots in general contact 3-manifolds and state a few related open problems.

Acknowledgment. The results presented here are part of my thesis [Ke17], which was partially supported by the *DFG-Graduiertenkolleg 1269 Globale Strukturen in Geometrie und Analysis* at the Universität zu Köln.

I would like to thank my advisor Hansjörg Geiges and my colleagues Sebastian Durst and Christian Evers.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND STATEMENT OF THE RESULTS

In this section we recall the necessary background about transverse knots and contact Dehn surgery along them and give the precise statements of the Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2.

2.1. Transverse knots in contact 3-manifolds.

A knot T in a contact 3-manifold (M, ξ) with cooriented contact structure is called **transverse**, if the contact planes ξ are everywhere transverse to the tangent space of the knot. Transverse knots admits a preferred orientation by the requirement that they are positive transverse to the contact structure. Here all transverse knots are understood to be oriented like this, but all results holds similar also for negative transverse knots. An important fact about transverse knots is that they locally all look the same [Ge08, Example 2.5.16].

Lemma 2.1 (Neighborhoods of transverse knots)

Let T be a transverse knot in (M, ξ) . Then there exists a **standard tubular neighborhood** νT of T in M such that $(\nu T, \xi)$ is contactomorphic to

$$(S^1 \times D_\varepsilon^2, \ker(d\theta + r^2 d\varphi)),$$

where θ is an angular coordinate on S^1 and (r, φ) are polar coordinates on the disk D_ε^2 with radius ε and the contactomorphism sends T to $S^1 \times \{0\}$.

Remark 2.2 (Size of the standard neighborhoods)

The size ε of such neighborhoods νT for transverse knots T is not arbitrary. The maximal value of this size is an invariant of the transverse knot T , as studied for example in [Ga99, Ga02, EtHo05, BaEt13, Co15].

Definition 2.3 (Complements and exteriors)

Let T be a transverse knot in (M, ξ) . Then one calls $(M \setminus T, \xi)$ the **complement** of T and $(M \setminus \nu T, \xi)$ an **exterior** of T .

Here I want to consider transverse knots up to coarse equivalence.

Definition 2.4 (Coarse equivalence)

Let T_1 and T_2 be two transverse knots in (M, ξ) . Then T_1 is **(coarse) equivalent** to T_2 , if there exists a contactomorphism f of (M, ξ)

$$\begin{aligned} f: (M, \xi) &\longrightarrow (M, \xi) \\ T_1 &\longmapsto T_2 \end{aligned}$$

that maps T_1 to T_2 .

Remark 2.5 (Coarse equivalence vs transverse isotopy)

The (coarse) equivalence is in general a weaker condition than the equivalence given by transverse isotopy (for example in overtwisted contact structures on S^3 [Vo16]). But one can show that in (S^3, ξ_{st}) this two concepts are the same (see [ElFr09, Section 4.3]).

If two transverse knots are coarse equivalent, their complements and exteriors are contactomorphic. The transverse knot complement or exterior problem asks if the reverse also holds. In Section 4 we prove Corollary 1.2, which can be made more precise as follows.

Corollary 2.6 (Transverse knot exterior theorem)

Let T_1 and T_2 be two transverse knots in (S^3, ξ_{st}) with contactomorphic sufficiently big exteriors (meaning that the size of the tubular neighborhoods is sufficiently small). Then T_1 and T_2 are equivalent.

2.2. Contact Dehn surgery along transverse knots.

Next, I recall the definition of contact Dehn surgery along transverse knots. Roughly speaking one cuts out the neighborhood of a transverse knot and glues a contact solid torus back in a different way to obtain a new contact 3-manifold. More precisely:

Definition 2.7 (Contact Dehn surgery along transverse knots)

Let T be a transverse knot in (M, ξ) . Take a standard tubular neighborhood νT and a non-trivial simple closed curve r on $\partial(\nu T)$ and a diffeomorphism φ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi: \partial(S^1 \times D^2) &\longrightarrow \partial(\nu T) \\ \{\text{pt}\} \times \partial D^2 := \mu_0 &\longmapsto r. \end{aligned}$$

Then define

$$(M_T(r), \xi_T(r)) := (S^1 \times D^2, \xi_S) + (M \setminus \overset{\circ}{\nu T}, \xi) / \sim, \\ \partial(S^1 \times D^2) \ni p \sim \varphi(p) \in \partial(\nu T),$$

where the contact structure ξ_S on $S^1 \times D^2$ is chosen, such that ξ_S and ξ fits together to a global new contact structure $\xi_T(r)$ on $M_T(r)$. One says that $(M_T(r), \xi_T(r))$ is obtained out of M by **contact Dehn surgery** along T with **slope** r .

It is easy to show that $M_T(r)$ is again a 3-manifold independent of the choice of φ . Also it is a standard fact that every nullhomologous knot T (for example if M is S^3) has a **Seifert surface**, i.e. a compact oriented surface S with oriented boundary T . Then one can obtain a special parallel copy of T on $\partial\nu T$, called the **surface longitude**, by pushing T in a Seifert surface S . (This is independent of the choice of the Seifert surface.) Then one can write any non-trivial simple closed curve r uniquely as $r = p\mu + q\lambda$ with μ the meridian of νT and p and q coprime integers. Therefore, it is often easier to think of r instead of a simple closed curve as a rational number $r = p/q \in \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$, where ∞ means $p = 1$ and $q = 0$. This rational number is called **surgery coefficient**.

Also it is easy to show that there exists always a contact structure ξ_S on $S^1 \times D^2$ that fits together with the old contact structure ξ (see for example the proof of Theorem 4.1.2 in [Ge08]), but this contact structure is in general not unique. Therefore, the resulting contact structure $\xi_T(r)$ on the new manifold is also not unique and depends moreover highly on the size of the tubular neighborhood νT .

Here we are interested in so-called **cosmetic contact Dehn surgeries** along transverse knots, i.e. situations where $(M_T(r), \xi_T(r))$ is again contactomorphic to (M, ξ) . That cosmetic contact Dehn surgeries do exist follows from the following theorem due to Etnyre and Ghrist [EtGh99, Theorem 2.2].

Theorem 2.8 (Existence of cosmetic contact surgeries)

There exists a transverse unknot T with self-linking number $sl = -1$ in (S^3, ξ_{st}) , such that for every surgery coefficient $r \in \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$ there exists a contact Dehn surgery along T yielding a tight contact manifold.

Since Dehn surgery along an unknot with surgery coefficient of the form $1/n$, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, gives back S^3 and since on S^3 the standard contact structure ξ_{st} is the only

tight contact structure, it follows that there exist cosmetic contact surgeries from (S^3, ξ_{st}) to itself for every surgery coefficient of the form $1/n$.

Observe also that transverse unknots in tight contact 3-manifolds are completely classified by their self-linking numbers [El93, Theorem 5.1.1]. Moreover, the possible values for the self-linking numbers are all negative odd integers. In particular, there is only one transverse unknot with self-linking number $\text{sl} = -1$.

Our main result, Theorem 1.1, is in contrast to the result of Etnyre and Ghrist and can be stated precisely as follows.

Theorem 2.9 (Transverse contact surgery theorem)

Let T be a transverse knot in (S^3, ξ_{st}) . If $(S_T^3(r), \xi_T(r))$, constructed using a sufficiently small tubular neighborhood νT , is contactomorphic to (S^3, ξ_{st}) for some $r \neq \infty$, then T is equivalent to the transverse unknot with self-linking number $\text{sl} = -1$.

Notice also, that the contact surgeries in Theorem 2.8 are done with respect to a sufficiently big tubular neighborhood of the knot T to ensure tightness of the resulting manifold as explained in [EtGh99, Remark 2.1]. For small tubular neighborhoods this theorem is not true. This I will explain in more detail in Section 5.

3. PROOF OF THE TRANSVERSE CONTACT DEHN SURGERY THEOREM

In [Ke16] a similar theorem is proven for **Legendrian** knots, i.e. smooth knots always tangent to the contact structure. The proof here follows the same ideas. First, it follows from the theorem of Gordon and Luecke [GoLu89] that T is topological equivalent to the unknot and an easy computation in homology shows that the surgery coefficient has to be of the form $r = 1/n$, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore by Eliashberg's classification of transverse unknots [El93, Theorem 5.1.1], T is equivalent to the unique transverse unknot U_{sl} with self-linking number sl .

The idea of the proof is now to consider, for every transverse unknot U_{sl} (other than U_{-1}) and every surgery coefficient of the form $r = 1/n$, a Legendrian knot L in the exterior $(S^3 \setminus \nu U_{\text{sl}}, \xi_{\text{st}})$ of U_{sl} . This Legendrian knot can also be seen as a Legendrian knot in the new surgered contact manifold $(S_{U_{\text{sl}}}^3(r), \xi_{U_{\text{sl}}}(r))$. In this situation the formula for computing the new **Thurston–Bennequin invariant** tb_{new} of the Legendrian knot L in the new contact manifold from [Ke16] simplifies to

$$\text{tb}_{\text{new}} = \text{tb}_{\text{old}} - n \text{lk}^2(L, T),$$

where tb_{old} is the old Thurston–Bennequin number of L in (S^3, ξ_{st}) and $\text{lk}(L, T)$ denotes the linking-number between L and T in (S^3, ξ_{st}) . Although the new contact structure $\xi_T(r)$ is not unique, the new Thurston–Bennequin invariant tb_{new} is.

A theorem by Eliashberg [El93] states that a contact manifold is **tight (not overtwisted)**, if and only if every nullhomologous Legendrian knot fulfills the **Bennequin inequality** $\text{tb} \leq 2g - 1$, where g denotes the genus of the knot. The strategy is then to find a Legendrian knot that violates the Bennequin inequality in the new surgered manifold, which then cannot be contactomorphic to (S^3, ξ_{st}) .

We want to present these situations in diagrams, called front projections. Observe that $(S^3 \setminus \{p\}, \xi_{\text{st}})$ is contactomorphic to $(\mathbb{R}^3, \ker x dy + dz)$. Therefore, one can present knots in (S^3, ξ_{st}) in their **front projection** $(x, y, z) \mapsto (y, z)$. If one parametrizes a knot as $(x(t), y(t), z(t))$ then the contact condition tells that the knot is Legendrian if and only if $\dot{z} + x\dot{y} = 0$. And similar such a knot is transverse

if and only if $\dot{z} + x\dot{y} > 0$. These conditions give restrictions on the behavior of these knots in crossings and vertical tangencies in front projections [Ge08, Chapter 3].

For example in Figure 1 the transverse unknots U_{sl} are pictured in their front-projections and in Figure 2 one can see the 4 possibilities of intersections of a Legendrian knot L and a transverse knot T in the front-projection. From the conditions before it follows immediately that the intersection of type (2) and (4) is uniquely determined, but in type (1) and (3) in general both is possible. But here it is enough to know the behavior in type (2) and (4) (see also [DuKe16] and [Ke17]).




FIGURE 1. A complete list of transverse unknots in their front projections






FIGURE 2. Front projections of Legendrian and transverse knots.

Consider now the front projection in Figure 3 of a transverse unknot T of type U_{sl} and a Legendrian unknot L in the exterior of T .


If one does a $(1/n)$ -surgery along U_{sl} then the knot L is (topologically) again an unknot in some new contact S^3 (this can be seen by doing a **Rolfesen twist** along U_{sl} , i.e. twisting n -times along the Seifert disk of U_{sl}). If the resulting manifold is again (S^3, ξ_{st}) then the Bennequin inequality holds, i.e. $tb_{new} \leq -1$. On the other hand we compute $tb_{new} = -1 - n$ with the above formula. So it follows that for $n < 0$ the resulting contact 3-sphere is not the standard one.

For $n > 0$ one considers the diagram from Figure 4. Observe that this does not work for the transverse unknot with self-linking number -1 , but for all other transverse unknots. The linking number is $lk(T, L) = 0$ and therefore the Thurston–Bennequin number of L stays the same, i.e. $tb_{new} = tb_{old} = -1$.

To show that the resulting contact 3-sphere is always overtwisted we first determine the new knot type L_n of L in the new S^3 . Therefore, observe that topologically

FIGURE 3. An overtwisted 3-sphere for $n < 0$.FIGURE 4. An overtwisted 3-sphere for $n > 0$.

the link $T \sqcup L$ is the Whitehead link, which can also be pictured like in Figure 5(i). By doing a Rolfsen twist along T we get the new knot L_n in the new S^3 pictured in Figure 5(ii).

FIGURE 5. A Rolfsen twist along T yields L_n .

Of course here the Bennequin inequality cannot help because the minimal bound in the Bennequin inequality is -1 . Therefore, one has to use a finer bound for the Thurston–Bennequin number. One such bound is the so-called **Kauffman**

bound [Ru90, Fe02], which says that for a Legendrian knot L in (S^3, ξ_{st}) the following inequality holds

$$\text{tb}(L) \leq \min \{ \deg_x (F_L(x, y)) \} - 1,$$

where $F_L(x, y)$ is the Kauffman polynomial of L . From the work of Tanaka [Ta06] and Yokota [Yo95] it follows that in the case of a reduced alternating knot diagram D_n of L_n (as is the case here) this inequality transforms to

$$\text{tb}(L_n) \leq \text{sl}(D_n) - \text{r}(D_n)$$

where $\text{sl}(D_n)$ is the self-linking number of the knot diagram D_n and $\text{r}(D_n)$ is the number of regions in the knot diagram D_n . By coloring the complement of an alternating knot diagram according to the rule in Figure 6(i) one gets the regions as the colored areas. (Moreover, in [Ta06] and [Yo95] it is shown that this bound is sharp, but this is not important for the argument here.)




FIGURE 6. Computing the Kauffman bound for L_n

In Figure 6(ii) one can count $\text{sl}(D_n) = 2n - 2$ and $\text{r}(D_n) = 2n + 1$. Therefore, every Legendrian realization of L_n in (S^3, ξ_{st}) has $\text{tb}(L_n) \leq -3$. But earlier I computed $\text{tb}_{new} = \text{tb}_{old} = -1$ in the new surgered contact 3-sphere. Therefore this new contact 3-sphere has to be overtwisted. $\square$

4. PROOF OF THE TRANSVERSE KNOT EXTERIOR THEOREM

The proof of the transverse knot exterior theorem 2.6 works now very similar as for topological or transverse knots. Compare [Ke16, Ke17].

Pick a contactomorphism between the exteriors

$$h: (S^3 \setminus \nu \mathring{T}_1, \xi_{st}) \longrightarrow (S^3 \setminus \nu \mathring{T}_2, \xi_{st}),$$

and then consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(S^3, \xi_{st}) \cong (S_{T_1}^3(\mu_1), \xi_{T_1}(\mu_1)) := (S^1 \times D^2, \xi_S) & + & (S^3 \setminus \nu \mathring{T}_1, \xi_{st}) / \sim \\
\downarrow f & \text{Id} \quad \circlearrowright \quad h & \\
(S_{T_2}^3(r_2), \xi_{T_2}(r_2)) := (S^1 \times D^2, \xi_S) & + & (S^3 \setminus \nu \mathring{T}_2, \xi_{st}) / \sim
\end{array}$$

$\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} \mu_1$
 $\mu_0 \xrightarrow{h \circ \varphi_1} r_2 := h(\mu_1)$

Here the contact solid torus $(S^1 \times D^2, \xi')$ is chosen to be equal to $(\nu T_1, \xi_{st})$. Because Id and h on the two factors are contactomorphisms and because they both send the characteristic foliations of the boundaries to each other, these two maps glue together to a contactomorphism f of the whole contact manifolds [Ge08, Section 2.5.4]. From the transverse contact Dehn surgery theorem 2.9 it follows that r_2 is equal to μ_2 , or T_2 is equivalent to the transverse unknot U_{-1} with self-linking number $\text{sl} = -1$.

If $r_2 = \mu_2$ then this is a trivial contact Dehn surgery, and so the contactomorphism f maps T_1 to T_2 .

In the other case the same argument with T_1 and T_2 reversed shows that T_1 is also equivalent to the transverse unknot U_{-1} . $\square$

5. EXTENSIONS AND OPEN PROBLEMS

5.1. Size of the standard neighborhoods.

Maybe it is not directly clear where in the proofs it is important that the standard neighborhoods of the transverse knots are sufficiently small. To see why it is, observe that the proof of the transverse Dehn surgery theorem shows a bit more. It is not only shown that if there exists a cosmetic contact Dehn surgery along a transverse knot in (S^3, ξ_{st}) , then this knot has to be the transverse unknot U_{-1} , but also the surgery coefficient has to be of the form $r = 1/n$ for $n > 0$ (so negative integers are excluded). At a first glance it looks as if this is a contradiction to the result of Etnyre–Ghrist (Theorem 2.8) about the existence of tight transverse knots.

But the surgeries in this theorem are done with respect to a sufficiently big tubular neighborhood of the transverse knot T to ensure tightness of the resulting manifold as explained in [EtGh99, Remark 2.1]. By contrast, in the proof of the transverse Dehn surgery theorem one has to choose sufficiently small neighborhoods of the transverse knot, in fact so small that one has enough space in the exterior for the Legendrian knot L . Both results together show that the Legendrian knot L from Figure 3 cannot be realized in a sufficiently small exterior of T .

But the exact size of the tubular neighborhoods remain unknown.

Question 5.1 (Size of tubular neighborhoods)

What is the maximal size of the tubular neighborhoods of T , such that one can realize the Legendrian knot L from Figure 3 in its complement? How is this size related to other notions of maximal neighborhoods of transverse knots (for example in [Ga99, Ga02, EtHo05, BaEt13, Co15])?

The existence question for cosmetic Dehn surgeries along transverse knots is also not completely solved.

Question 5.2 (Transverse cosmetic contact surgeries from (S^3, ξ_{st}) to itself.)
Does Theorem 2.9 also holds for arbitrary neighborhoods? Are there cosmetic contact surgeries along U_{-1} with small neighborhoods?

Observe, that if Theorem 2.9 holds for arbitrary neighborhoods then the transverse knot exterior problem is also true for arbitrary neighborhoods, since in its proof the size of the neighborhood is not used.

5.2. Complements and exteriors.

As already mentioned in the introduction from the work of Edwards [Ed64] it follows that for topological knots two knot complements are homeomorphic if and only if the knot exteriors are homeomorphic. For transverse knots in contact manifold this is not clear (see [Ke17, Section 6.4] for more discussion on this problem). In particular, the knot complement problem for transverse knots in (S^3, ξ_{st}) remains open.

Question 5.3 (Transverse knot complement problem)
Let T_1 and T_2 be knots in (S^3, ξ_{st}) with contactomorphic complements $(S^3 \setminus T_i, \xi_{st})$. Is T_1 equivalent to T_2 ?

5.3. The transverse link complement problem.

An obvious question is if the transverse knot exterior theorem is also true for links. It will turn out that this is not the case. There exist (infinitely many) non-equivalent transverse 2-component links in (S^3, ξ_{st}) with contactomorphic exteriors. The idea for constructing such examples is the same as for topological links [Wh37].

Example 5.4 (Counterexample for transverse links)

Consider the so-called Whitehead link from Figure 5(i). Chose T in (S^3, ξ_{st}) to be a transverse unknot with $sl = -1$ with standard tubular neighborhood from Theorem 2.8 of Etnyre-Ghrist. So that contact $(1/n)$ -Dehn surgery along T with respect to this standard tubular neighborhood yields again (S^3, ξ_{st}) . Next chose a transverse realization of L in the exterior of T (with respect to the chosen tubular neighborhood of T).

A contact $(1/n)$ -Dehn surgery along T yields (S^3, ξ_{st}) back but the transverse knot L changes to a transverse knot with underlying topological knot type L_n from Figure 5(ii) which is clearly non-equivalent to L . Moreover from the proof of Theorem 2.8 it follows directly that the new glued-in solid torus is the standard tubular neighborhood of a new transverse knot T_n .

Therefore, the transverse links $T \sqcup L$ and $T_n \sqcup L_n$ have contactomorphic exteriors but are not equivalent (since they are not even topologically equivalent).

Again, it is unclear how the above example depends on the size of the tubular neighborhoods of the knots. The neighborhood of T has to be big (such that the cosmetic contact Dehn surgery of Etnyre and Ghrist works) and the neighborhood of L has to be so small, that it does not intersect the neighborhood of T . It remains open if such examples exist for arbitrary size of standard tubular neighborhoods of the transverse links.

5.4. The transverse knot complement problem in general manifolds.

Another obvious question is, if transverse knots in general contact manifolds are also determined by the contactomorphism type of their exteriors. Again, as for topological knots, this is in general not true.

Example 5.5 (Counterexample for transverse knots in general manifolds)

Consider a standard neighborhood νT of a transverse knot T with size $\varepsilon = 1/3$. The characteristic foliation on the boundary $\partial(\nu T)$ is given by the vector field

$$X = \partial_\varphi - \frac{1}{3}\partial_\theta.$$

If one denotes the longitude $S^1 \times \{p\}$ of $\partial(\nu T)$ by λ , then the characteristic foliation of $\partial(\nu T)$ is given by the linear curves $-\mu + 3\lambda$.

Now take two copies V_1 and V_2 of this standard tubular neighborhood and glue them together along their boundaries as follows

$$\begin{array}{rclclcl} L(9, 7) & = & L(9, -2) & = & V_1 & + & V_2 & / \sim \\ & & & & \mu_1 \longmapsto & & -2\mu_2 + 9\lambda_2, \\ & & & & \lambda_1 \longmapsto & & -\mu_2 + 4\lambda_2. \end{array}$$

The characteristic foliation given by $-\mu_1 + 3\lambda_1$ of ∂V_1 is mapped to the characteristic foliation given by $-\mu_2 + 3\lambda_2$ of ∂V_2 . Therefore, the contact structures on the two solid tori glue together to a global contact structure on the lens space $L(9, -2) = L(9, 7)$. If one chooses the tubular neighborhoods of T_i as V_i , then by construction the corresponding exteriors are the same.

But it is easy to see that the knots T_1 and T_2 are not even topologically equivalent. (A homeomorphism of the lens space mapping one knot to the other, restricts to the complementary solid torus to a map not isotopic to a composition of Dehn twist, which is impossible. See [Ro93] or [Ke17, Section 1.3] for details.)

Again, it remains open if such examples exists for arbitrary standard neighborhoods. It would also be interesting to know what happens in overtwisted contact 3-spheres.

Question 5.6 (Transverse knot exterior problem in overtwisted 3-spheres)

Let T_1 and T_2 be knots in an overtwisted contact 3-sphere (S^3, ξ_{ot}) with contactomorphic complements $(S^3 \setminus T_i, \xi_{\text{ot}})$. Is T_1 equivalent to T_2 ?

Recall, that in overtwisted 3-spheres coarse-equivalence is a weaker condition than isotopy of transverse links [Vo16].

REFERENCES

- [BaEt13] J. BALDWIN AND J. ETNYRE, Admissible transverse surgery does not preserve tightness, *Math. Ann.* **37** (2013), 441–468.
- [Co15] J. CONWAY, Transverse Surgery on Knots in Contact 3-Manifolds, [arXiv:1409.7077](https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.7077) (2015).
- [De10] M. DEHN, Über die Topologie des dreidimensionalen Raumes, *Math. Ann.* **69** (1910), 137–168.
- [DiGe04] F. DING AND H. GEIGES, A Legendrian surgery presentation of contact 3-manifolds, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **136** (2004), 583–598.
- [DuKe16] S. DURST AND M. KEGEL, Computing rotation and self-linking numbers in contact surgery diagrams, *Acta Math. Hungar.* **150** (2016), 524–540.

- [Ed64] J. EDWARDS, Concentricity in 3-manifolds, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **113** (1964), 406–423.
- [El93] Y. ELIASHBERG, Legendrian and transverse knots in tight contact 3-manifolds, in: *Topological Methods in Modern Mathematics* (Stony Brook, 1991), Publish or Perish, Houston (1993), 171–193.
- [ElFr09] Y. ELIASHBERG AND M. FRASER, Topologically trivial Legendrian knots, *J. Symplectic Geom.* **7** (2009), 77–127.
- [EtGh99] J. ETNYRE AND R. GHRIST, Tight contact structures via dynamics, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **127** (1999), 3697–3706.
- [EtHo05] J. ETNYRE AND K. HONDA, Cabling and transverse simplicity, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **162** (2005), 1305–1333.
- [Fe02] E. FERRAND, On Legendrian knots and polynomial invariants, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **130** (2002), 1169–1176.
- [Ga99] D. GAY, Symplectic 4-dimensional 2-handles and contact surgery along transverse knots, Ph.D. Thesis, UC Berkeley (1999).
- [Ga02] D. GAY, Symplectic 2-handles and transverse links, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **354** (2002), 1027–1047.
- [Ge08] H. GEIGES, *An Introduction to Contact Topology*, Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math. **109** (Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- [GoLu89] C. GORDON AND J. LUECKE, Knots are determined by their complements, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **2** (1989), 371–415.
- [Ke16] M. KEGEL, The Legendrian knot complement problem, [arXiv:1604.05196](https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.05196) (2016).
- [Ke17] M. KEGEL, Legendrian knots in surgery diagrams and the knot complement problem, Doktorarbeit (Ph.D. thesis), Universität zu Köln (2017).
- [Li62] R. LICKORISH, A representation of orientable combinatorial 3-manifolds, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **76** (1962), 531–540.
- [Ma92] Y. MATHIEU, Closed 3-manifolds unchanged by Dehn surgery, *J. Knot Theory Ramifications* **1** (1992), 279–296.
- [Ro93] Y. RONG, Some knots not determined by their complements, in: "Quantum topology", Ser. Knots Everything **3**, (World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 1993), 339–353.
- [Ru90] L. RUDOLPH, A congruence between link polynomials, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **107** (1990), 319–327.
- [Ta06] T. TANAKA, Maximal Thurston–Bennequin numbers of alternating links, *Topology Appl.* **153** (2006), 2476–2483.
- [Ti08] H. TIETZE, Über die topologischen Invarianten mehrdimensionaler Mannigfaltigkeiten, *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik* **19** (1908), 1–118.
- [Vo16] T. VOGEL, Non-loose unknots, overtwisted discs, and the contact mapping class group of S^3 , [arXiv:1612.06557](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.06557) (2016).
- [Wa60] A. WALLACE, Modifications and cobounding manifolds, *Canad. J. Math.* **12** (1960), 503–528.
- [Wh37] J. WHITEHEAD, On doubled knots, *J. London Math. Soc.* **12** (1937), 63–71.
- [Yo95] Y. YOKOTA, The Kauffman polynomial of alternating links, *Topology Appl.* **65** (1995), 229–236.

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT ZU KÖLN, WEYERTAL 86–90, 50931 KÖLN
[HTTP://WWW.MI.UNI-KOELN.DE/~MKEGEL/](http://www.mi.uni-koeln.de/~mkegel/)
E-mail address: mkegel@math.uni-koeln.de